

CONCORDIA COUNCIL ON STUDENT LIFE

Minutes of Meeting held in Room AD-128, Loyola Campus, at 5:30 p.m. on  
April 5, 1977

---

PRESENT: Mr. B. Rennie, Chairman, Dean A. Audet, Dr. E. Enos, Mr. J. A. Sproule, Mr. J. Macaluso, Mr. J. Hopkins, Ms. B. Litner, Mr. F. Denton, Prof. R. Allison, Prof. W. Gilsdorf, Ms. L. Brooks, Ms. N. Marrelli, Mr. J. James, Mr. R. Davies, Ms. M. O'Dea, Mr. C. Wisniewski, Mr. J. Bernier, Ms. A. Kubicek, Ms. R. Scully, Ms. S. Lavinskas, Mr. N. Hébert, Mr. J. J. Robertson, Mr. W. Kotiuga.

ABSENT: Mr. B. Philip, Prof. L. Van Toch, Prof. L. Adler, Prof. T. Fancott, Mr. K. McGrath, Mr. J. J. Pepper.

ALTERNATES: Mr. Yvon Jeghers for Mr. P. Jacek, Mr. D. Insley for Dean M. Flynn, Rev. R. Gaudet, S. J. for Mr. B. Counihan.

Chairman's Remarks

- 77.6.1 The Chairman called the meeting to order and announced that Father Gaudet was replacing Mr. Counihan, Mr. Doug. Insley was representing Dean Flynn and Mr. Yvon Jeghers was replacing Mr. Peter Jacek for this meeting.

Mr. Rennie then turned the meeting over to Mr. J. Macaluso, Chairman of the Finance Committee.

Report of the Finance Committee

- 77.6.2 Mr. Macaluso reported that the Finance Committee had met for 2½ hours on April 1 with Dr. O'Brien, Father Graham and Mr. Graham Martin, Vice Rector, Administration and Finance. He said Fincom explained to the Rectorate that they were an information gathering group, not a negotiating team for CCSL and that any further action would have to be taken by Council.

The Rector stated that any transfer of funds was out of the question for 1977-78 inasmuch as all funds had been allocated. He explained that the University receives funds from Government grants and from tuition. From this it must pay its bills for fully admissible programs. The Rector drew a parallel here. Student Services receives funds from a per capita government grant and student services fees and from this, it too must pay its bills. Fincom was informed that the Athletic Complex is classified as academic space under the Bio-Physical Education program and therefore any non-academic use is possible only after fulfilling the primary, i.e. academic, purposes of the installation. Regarding the CCSL rationale vis a vis the promotional value of athletics, the Rector disagreed as a matter of principle with the University being promoted by athletics.

The Rectorate pointed out that any discussion with respect to cuts in the student services budget would be considered a serious recommendation only if several months, e.g. 18, were to elapse between such a recommendation and its implementation. This means that no cut in expenditure could be recommended for immediate implementation, certainly not for 1977/78. If CCSL in the future wishes Fincom to undertake the study of any proposed cut or reduction in any service this lead-time principle must be borne in mind.

When asked how the Rectorate viewed the role of CCSL the following reply was received: It is up to CCSL to organize priorities and make proposals based on these priorities. The Board of Governors would then consider well thought out proposals if given proper lead-time, i.e. 1½ years, after a study has been made by the Rectorate. A study could be made by a committee, recommending a cut in a given area. This would be submitted to the Rectorate with sufficient lead-time to act on the recommendation. The Rectorate feels that one of the major functions of CCSL is to define the direction of student services.

The level of student services fees was discussed. With costs going up, fees will have to increase. Fees have been kept artificially low for a number of reasons, one being the forfaitaire. The Government paid the cost-of-living increases directly in addition to the per capita grant in the past. The increased salary item was therefore borne by the Government, and not by increased student services fees. Government assistance in this area has since ceased, and the government has stated that increases in salaries must be met from the per capita grant and the student services fees. The Rector suggested that Council seek a policy that would contemplate a rise in fees over the next few years combined with a sorting out of priorities. It will not be easy, he stated.

Government policy on the academic side has been to keep tuition down, and the Government subsidy has taken the whole brunt on the academic side of rising costs. Exactly the opposite policy exists in student services. The grant will not rise, therefore student services fees must rise. Until now student services have had artificial relief. Student services fees are less than would be the case were strict accounting procedures followed. Last year it was decided not to raise student services fees as much as necessary; this compromise, the Rector said, makes an increase mandatory for 1977/78. Mr. Macaluso reported that there seemed to be only one option open to Council for 1977/78, that was to raise student services fees.

In summation, Mr. Macaluso reported that the Rector indicated that no cuts in expenses would be favourably considered at this late date. The Rectorate cannot compromise on any part of the suggested transfer of funds. The Finance Committee had been led to believe that tuition waiver, capital expenditure and telephones were paid for in other areas by central administration. The Rectorate informed them that this is not the case and has never been the practice, leaving no room for dialogue. Council cannot legislate any major change because of time constraints, for example in an ideal situation the budget would have been given to Fincom in October 1975, not February 1977.

#### 77.6.2.1

Mr. Denton reported on further recent input from the Treasurer's office in the matter of collection of student services fees. He reviewed the decision of Council on March 15, 1977 to reject a student services fee based on a percentage of tuition, voting instead to maintain the present method of collection, \$67.50 for full-time students and \$13.50 for part-time students. Father Graham had asked, in his letter to Mr. Rennie, dated March 21, 1977, that the Treasurer be given explicit instructions regarding the collection of student services fees under the current method. Copies of a letter, dated

- 3 -

April 4, 1977, addressed to Vice Rector Martin from Mr. Reay enclosing two suggested plans for the collection of student services fees, referred to as Option A and Option B were distributed to the Council. Mr. Reay described two methods of collecting fees which he believed would solve the problems he has encountered and also work to the benefit of student services. This would be done by computer. Mr. Denton reported that Mr. Reay's preference was for Option A. The proposed methods differ from the current one in that the status of students, whether part or full-time, would be determined on the basis of tuition payments instead of credits enabling the Treasurer's office to run a computer check after the course change period to properly re-evaluate the status of the student, in fairness to both students and the income side of the student services budget. When queried about the financial implications of all submissions, Mr. Denton admitted that no reliable predictions were available or even possible.

Some discussion ensued concerning whether or not a student services fee would be payable for students taking summer courses under Option B, but no consensus was established.

Finally, it was MOVED by Prof. Gilsdorf, SECONDED by Mr. Sproule

"THAT Option A be adopted."

MOTION CARRIED.

77.6.2.2

The Chairman of the Finance Committee reported that the Rector had expressed some concern with regard to Graduate Student Services Fees, and would appreciate some indication from Council with regard to options involved. Mr. Kotiuga, the Graduate Students' Association representative, reported on a study he had made of this subject. Because of the unique problems involved in categorizing graduate students and because no significant difference in the amounts paid would result according to Mr. Kotiuga's findings, and also to simplify matters for all concerned, it was MOVED by Mr. Kotiuga, SECONDED by Mr. Hopkins

"THAT graduate students pay a student services fee based on a percentage of tuition, 13.5% for 1977/78."

Following questions and discussion the MOTION CARRIED.

77.6.2.3

A MOTION to accompany the Budget C recommendation to the Board of Governors was PROPOSED by Prof. Gilsdorf, SECONDED by Ms. Litner

"THAT CCSL is not prepared to recommend an increase in student services fees with such little lead time for the 1977/78 school year. It is, however, prepared to ask the Finance Committee to study both the amount and method of collection of student services fees with an eye to recommendations for the 1978/79 school year."

MOTION CARRIED.

- 4 -

- 77.6.2.4 It was suggested that since CCSL is presenting a budget which is not acceptable to the Rector it might be advisable to appoint a spokesman to give Council's rationale to the Board of Governors.

It was MOVED by Dean Audet, SECONDED by Ms. Litner

"THAT the Finance Committee be empowered to appoint one or more of its members to present Budget C to the Finance Committee of the Board of Governors."

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

In this connection Mr. Kotiuga offered his services in extending an invitation from the Finance Committee of the Board of Governors to its meeting the following day, April 6.

- 77.6.2.5 Mr. Davies proposed studying the General Recommendations from the Finance Committee, but since few members of Council had this document before them it was MOVED by Dean Audet, SECONDED by Mr. Hopkins THAT these recommendations be put on the Agenda for the next meeting of CCSL.

New Business

- 77.6.3 Three items were referred to Steering Committee for study:-
- a) Election of a Chairman to act during the summer.
  - b) Membership of Council for the year 1977/78.
  - c) The role of the Priorities Committee. Mr. Hébert stated that it was hoped that this Committee would be made a Standing Committee of Council.

The Meeting adjourned at 7 p.m.